

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM

STATE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & ECONOMIC GROWTH I ANSING

ROBERT W. SWANSON

Analysis of Enrolled House Bills 5885-6

Topic: County Review of Municipal Plans

Sponsor: Representative Stakoe

Co-Sponsors: Representatives Amos and Huizenga

Committee: House Local Government and Urban Policy

Senate Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs

Date Introduced: March 16, 2006

Date Enrolled: December 7, 2007

Date of Analysis: December 5, 2006

Position: The Department of Labor & Economic Growth supports the bill.

Problem/Background: Public Acts 263-5 of 2001 amended the Township, City and Village, and County Planning Acts to require planning commissions to consult with other neighboring governmental units in the preparation of master plans and the adoption of plans. Although the objective of these amendatory acts to encourage consultation was worthwhile, the practical result has been delays in the planning process. Most counties are not bothering to submit comments on other units' plans. Only Washtenaw and Oakland Counties currently comment on plans pursuant to these acts.

Description of Bill: The bill deletes the requirement that counties comment on proposed local plans. Entities whose review is required by the acts would have 63 days rather than the current 65 days in which to submit comments.

Summary of Arguments

Pro: The current process is not working, because most counties do not bother to review proposed municipal plans and even fewer submit comments. The review system initiated in 2001 has had the unintended effect of lengthening the planning process without providing the regional consultation and coordination sought by the Legislature. The bill maintains the concept of county review for those counties that want it but makes the process voluntary.

Con: The new system has not been in operation for very many years, and it is premature to change it at this point. A few counties do review local plans and the provisions in the bill would reduce the amount of time that these counties have to submit comments. The shorter time frame will place an excessive burden on county planning staffs in these counties.

Fiscal/Economic Impact:

The bill will have no fiscal impact on state government.

Other State Departments:

The Department of Environmental Quality has recommended support for the bill.

Any Other Pertinent Information:

Senator Birkholz was the sponsor of one of the original bills in the 2001 package. The Michigan Association of Planning supports the bill. The Michigan Association of Counties does not oppose the bill.

Administrative Rules Impact:

No new or revised rules will be required.